TELLS THE FACTS AND NAMES THE NAMES

CounterPunch

DEC. 16-31, 2007 ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR VOL. 14, NO. 22

Why the U.S. Occupation is Faring Better in Iraq

By Patrick Cockburn

Some 19 U.S. soldiers were killed in December 2007, the lowest number of American military fatalities in a single month since the invasion of Iraq in March 2003. As recently as May this year, 135 U.S. soldiers were shot dead or blown up by Iraqi guerrillas.

The fall in U.S. casualties was one of the most surprising events of 2007. At the beginning of the year, the U.S. occupation in Iraq seemed to be clinging on by its fingertips, as more and more of the country came under the control of Sunni and Shia warlords. Twelve months later, U.S. units were peaceably patrolling districts of Baghdad, where once they faced ambushes at every street corner.

Viewed from the White House, events in Iraq seem to be one of the few optimistic developments in the series of crises facing the U.S. in the central core of the Islamic world, as the fragility of the U.S. position is underlined by the assassination of Benazir Bhutto, one of its main allies, in Pakistan.

Iraqis and the outside world are equally perplexed as to what this means. Are we seeing the beginning of the end of the fighting in Iraq, a conflict, which has now gone on for longer than World War I? Or is it a lull in the violence that is bound to end because Shia, Sunnis, Kurds and Americans are as divided as ever?

Significant changes have taken place in Iraq in the last twelve months. The most important is that part of the Sunni Arab community, the core of the insurgency against the U.S. occupation, has changed sides and is now fighting al-Qaeda in alliance with the U.S. military. This dramatic switch in allegiance occurred primarily because the Sunni Arabs, only 20 per cent of Iraq's population, were being

PATRICK COCKBURN CONT. ON PAGE 2

Hogwash

Fecal Factories in the Heartland

By Jeffrey St. Clair

I grew up south of Indianapolis, on the glacier-smoothed plains of central Indiana. My grandparents owned a small farm, whittled down over the years to about 40 acres of bottomland, in some of the most productive agricultural land in America. Like many of their neighbors, they mostly grew field corn (and later soybeans), raised a few cows, and bred a few horses.

Even then farming for them was a hobby, an avocation, a link to a way of life that was slipping away. My grandfather, who was born on that farm in 1906, graduated from Purdue University and became a master electrician, who helped design RCA's first color TV. My grandmother, the only child of an unwed mother, came to the U.S.A. at the age of 13 from the industrial city of Sheffield, England. When she married my grandfather, she'd never seen a cow. A few days after the honeymoon, she was milking one. She ran the local drugstore for nearly 50 years. In their so-called spare time, they farmed.

My parent's house was in a sterile and treeless subdivision about five miles away, but I largely grew up on that farm: feeding the cattle and horses, baling hay, bush-hogging pastures, weeding the garden, gleaning corn from the harvested field, fishing for catfish in the creek that divided the fields and pastures from the small copse of woods, learning to identify the songs of birds – a lifelong passion.

The farm, which had been in my mother's family since 1845, was in an unalterable state of decay by the time I arrived on the scene in 1959. The great red barn, with its multiple levels, vast hayloft and secret rooms, was in disrepair; the grain silos were empty and rusting ruins; the great beech trees that stalked the pasture hollowed out and died off, one by one, winter by winter.

In the late 1960s, after a doomed battle, the local power company condemned a swath of land right through the heart of the cornfield for a high-voltage transmission corridor. A fifth of the field was lost to the giant towers, and the songs of redwing blackbirds and meadowlarks were drowned out by the bristling electric hum of the power lines.

After that, the neighbors began selling out. The local diary went first, replaced by a retirement complex, an indoor tennis center, and a sprawling Baptist temple and school. Then came a gas station, a golf course and a McDonalds. Then two large subdivisions of upscale houses and a manmade lake, where the water was dyed Sunday cartoon blue.

When my grandfather died from pancreatic cancer (most likely inflicted by the pesticides that had been forced upon him by the ag companies) in the early 1970s, he and a hog farmer by the name of Boatenright were the last holdouts in that patch of black-soiled land along Buck Creek.

Boatenright's place was about a mile down the road. You couldn't miss it. He was a hog farmer, and the noxious smell permeated the valley. On hot, humid days, the sweat stench of the hogs was nauseating, even at a distance. In August, I'd work in the fields with a bandana wrapped around my face to ease the stench. How strange that I've come to miss that wretched smell.

That hog farm along Buck Creek was typical for its time. It was a small operation with about 25 pigs. Old man Boatenright also ran some cows and made money fixing tractors, brush hogs and combines.

Not any more. There are more hogs than ever in Indiana, but fewer hog

ST. CLAIR CONT. ON PAGE 5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

overwhelmed by the Shia, the branch of Islam to which 60 per cent of Iraqis belong.

The U.S. and British armies have examined many past guerrilla wars, looking for parallels, which might prove useful in combating the Iraqi insurgency. British generals were once particularly keen on proudly citing their actions in Malaya and Northern Ireland as providing rich experience in anti-guerrilla warfare. Most analogies were highly misleading. "Basra was the exact opposite of Northern Ireland and Malaya," a British officer told me in exasperation. "In the latter we were supported by the majority communities while we fought the Roman Catholic and Chinese minorities. In southern Iraq our main problem is that we had no real local allies."

The Americans suffer from a similar problem in central Iraq. Outside Kurdistan, it is difficult to find an Iraqi who supports the U.S. occupation for more than tactical reasons.

Seldom mentioned for obvious reasons is the one recent anti-guerilla war, which has many similarities to that being fought by the U.S.A. America in Iraq. This is Russia's successful re-conquest of Chechnya between 1999 and the present.

In a similar way to al-Qaeda in Iraq, the Islamic fundamentalists in Chechnya, invariably called Wahabi, played an increasingly central role in the armed resistance to the Russian forces. But the savagery of their fighters alienated many anti-Russian Chechens and eventually split the insurgency. I remember being astonished that Chechen human rights workers, who usually denounced Russian atrocities to me, were prepared to cooperate with the Russian army to attack the Wahabi. Often, their motive was a blood feud against a Wahabi commander who had killed their relatives.

The parallels between Iraq and Chechnya should not be carried too far. The U.S.A. has effectively raised a Sunni militia force, which may soon total 100,000 men, many of them former insurgents. They are armed and paid for by the U.S. but regard the Shia-Kurdish government with deep suspicion. Many Sunni commanders speak of taking on the Shia militia, the Mehdi Army, which has been stood down by its leader, Muqtada al-Sadr.

The U.S.A. has had real operational successes on the ground in Iraq in the last year, but there is little sign yet of Iraq being pacified.

It is a bizarre situation. One experienced Iraqi politician told me that al-Qaeda in Iraq, which never had much connection with Osama bin Laden's organization, had effectively split last year. A sign of this was when somebody betrayed the location of its leader, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, to the U.S. military, which bombed his hideout and killed him. Some of the so-called "Concerned Citizens" militiamen, now on the U.S. payroll, are former al-Qaeda fighters, though the U.S. is still holding hundreds of men in dire conditions in Guantanamo, accusing them of being associates of al-Qaeda.

The U.S.A. has had real operational successes on the ground in Iraq in the last year, but there is little sign yet of Iraq being pacified. Local warlords in Sunni areas have switched from attacking U.S. forces to working with them, but they might easily switch back tomorrow. As with the British in Basra, the Americans lack long-term allies who can stand on their own feet without U.S. assistance. The war could rekindle easily enough. The Shia will never accept their political dominance being eroded by a U.S.-backed Sunni resurgence. Iran has eased off its support for Shia militias, but it will likewise want to keep the Shia religious parties in power and make sure that Iraq will never become a potential platform for a U.S. attack on Iran.

This is one of the dangers of the continuing U.S. presence. The longer it goes on, the more the government of Iraq becomes incapable of existing without U.S. support. The government in the Green Zone is a hothouse plant, which would wither and die without the American military presence. Although Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki complains about the way in which the U.S. controls the Iraqi army, he makes little practical effort to move out of the Green Zone or establish his practical independence. The U.S. may say that it will leave when the Iraqi government can stand on its own two feet, but the continuing occupation makes sure that day does not come.

Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan are very different countries, but they are the terrain in which President Bush chose to test the United States' status as a superpower. They are also countries where it is difficult to win a decisive victory because power is so fragmented. Successes often turn out to be illusory or exaggerated. For instance, the Taliban was so swiftly overthrown in 2001 because the local warlords, whom the Taliban had bribed or intimidated into supporting it, found that the U.S. offered bigger bribes and its bombers were more intimidating. They changed sides once again, though very few of them went out of business.

The same is true of Iraq today. Iraqi parties, movements and communities have an extraordinary ability to withstand outside pressure. Most of them survived Saddam Hussein and are not going to buckle under anything the U.S. can do to them. **CP**

Patrick Cockburn's forthcoming book, *Muqtada! Muqtada al-Sadr, the Shia revival and the struggle for Iraq*, will be published by Scribner in April 2008.

CounterPunch

EDITORS
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Alevtina Rea

BUSINESS
Becky Grant
Deva Wheeler

DESIGN
Tiffany Wardle

COUNSELOR
Ben Sonnenberg

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org
All rights reserved.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cassandra Industry

By Alexander Cockburn

Many on the left spent a good deal of 2007 predicting that a U.S. attack on Iran was imminent. Their confidence in this prophecy was absolute. They used the word "will," as opposed to the mealy-mouthed, timorous "might". Some of them confidently asserted that the Bush administration would accompany this onslaught with the imposition of martial law in the United States and the suspension of elections in 2008.

The anticipatory fever was fanned by bulletins from Seymour Hersh in the *New Yorker*, disclosing supposed plans for shock-and-awe bombings of Iranian nuclear labs and test facilities, along with assertions that U.S. special forces were already active inside Iran's borders. The London *Sunday Times* told its readers that the Israelis were poised to drop nukes.

Such alarums have been a staple of the Internet over two years. Here's a fairly typical report from December 2005, from a seasoned doomsayer, Michael Chossudovsky, on the Global Research site:

"The launching of an outright war using nuclear warheads against Iran is now in the final planning stages.

"Coalition partners, which include the U.S., Israel and Turkey are in 'an advanced stage of readiness'. Various military exercises have been conducted, starting in early 2005. In turn, the Iranian Armed Forces have also conducted large-scale military maneuvers in the Persian Gulf in December in anticipation of a U.S. sponsored attack.

"Since early 2005, there has been intense shuttle diplomacy between Washington, Tel Aviv, Ankara and NATO headquarters in Brussels... Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has given the green light to the Israeli Armed Forces to launch the attacks by the end of March... The U.S.-sponsored military plan has been endorsed by NATO, although it is unclear, at this stage, as to the nature of NATO's involvement in the planned aerial attacks."

Then, at the start of December 2007, came disclosure of the long-heralded coup, but it was of an unheralded nature. Sixteen U.S. intelligence agencies contributed to a National Intelligence Estimate [NIE], asserting that Iran stopped trying to build a nuclear weapon in 2003, thus flatly contradicting Bush and Cheney's clamorous invocation of the Iranian nuclear threat.

One could draw some immediate conclusions. The NIE represented a carefully crafted onslaught on Bush, Cheney and the war party by the intelligence bureaucracies, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other institutional opponents of an attack on Iran. For those reluctant to discard long-held confidence in the malign omniscience of the Bush administration, there was the optional theory that Bush and Cheney had decided to ratchet down any war plans and cleared the NIE as a way of getting the administration off the hook. Against this theory one could point to the anger of the White House at the CIA, visible in the White House's fanning of the uproar over the Agency's destruction of its tapes of CIA torturers in action.

Oddly enough, the left doesn't care for good news – i.e., manifestations of imperial weakness. It prefers the somber monochrome of imperial invincibility.

But whatever way one looked at it, the war party and the Israel lobby had clearly sustained a humiliating reversal. Read as a judicious assessment of the balance of forces in the region, rather than as concrete "intelligence" of overheard conversations, the NIE was an acknowledgement of imperial weakness.

Oddly enough, the left doesn't care for good news – i.e., manifestations of imperial weakness. It prefers the somber monochrome of imperial invincibility. It's the mindset that fuels the conviction that only the American government could have engineered the successful 9/11/2001 attacks. After brief inspection of news stories about the NIE, the doomsayers sped back to their laptops to reiterate their predictions of an imminent attack on Iran. Remember those dogs in Konrad Lorenz's *Man Meets Dog*, who run up and down, day after day, barking at each other through the fence. Finally the fence is removed. After a moment's hesitation, the dogs continue their drill, patrolling the imaginary fence.

Back on September 9, 2007, Michael Neumann, valued CounterPuncher and author of *The Case Against Israel*, published by CounterPunch Books, dropped me a note at a moment when predictions of a U.S.-Israeli attack on Iran were particularly strident. Michael wrote thus:

"Purely for fun, I want to go on record here and say what I've said for a couple of years now. The U.S. will never, ever, ever, mount any serious attack on Iran. More than that, I doubt they will mount a single air strike.

"Why? The U.S. is much too weak. This is what the whole West just can't get into its head. Iran understands this, and it understands that, push come to shove, American policymakers know it too, brave words to the contrary. These days, the U.S. speaks loudly and carries a little stick. That's why Iran treats the West with contempt.

"The U.S. can no longer even contemplate incurring the causalities that result from fighting an enemy, neither microscopic nor crippled by years of sanctions. America would be utterly unequipped to deal with anything Iran cared to dish out by land, and utterly incapable of protecting oil supplies in all sorts of places Iran could reach. True, much of Iran's threat advantage has to do with irregular warfare, but only a frat-boy analysis of military capacities would lead anyone to claim that irregular warfare 'doesn't count'. Lebanon provided an oblique glimpse of Iranian capacities in this area.

"The hysteria about Iran is the best, most current indication of how left-wing thought is crippled by the same delusions of American power that affect other Americans."

One could argue that the main purpose of the Bush administration's thundering about bombing Iran was to indicate to its leaders that the cost of continued arms supplies by Iran to the Shi'ite forces in Iraq would be billions in damage to Iran's infrastructure by high explosive from US planes and missiles. It's obvious that those supplies have been curtailed. But beyond that, the weakness is profound. These recent years have been a disaster for the U.S. strategically. **CP**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What It's Like To Be Waterboarded

By "Scylla"

So much talk of waterboarding, so much controversy. But what is it really? How bad?

To determine the answer, I knew I had to try it.

I figure I would be a good test subject. I am incredibly fit and am training for a 100-mile endurance run. The main thing about such an event is ability to tolerate pain. I am good at this. I am trained.

I also have experience with free-diving from my college days. I once held my breath for four minutes and two seconds. Once, while training as a lifeguard, I swam laps without breathing until I passed out, so that I could know my limits.

So, here's what I would do. First, I would google "waterboarding" to understand the basic concepts, than I would try it on myself. First, self-inflicted and then, if necessary, inflicted by my wife. (She has no problem torturing me. We've been married almost 15 years.)

These are the results of my research and experience:

The goal of waterboarding is to simulate drowning without the actual drowning or inhalation into the lungs. In order to accomplish this, the subject is forced to lie on an inclined plane with his head lower than his lungs, and then water is dumped onto his/her face (always keeping the lungs above the "water line"). This simulates drowning and causes a panic.

There are some advanced techniques that make this more extreme, but that's the basic concept.

Easy enough to duplicate. I have an inclined weight bench and a watering can. No problem. I lie on this and tilt the water can to pour water on my mouth and nose. Water goes up my nose causing me to gag and choke and splutter, but after a try or two I'm able to suppress my reflex, relax, breathe in shallowly, and then expel rapidly (shooting out the water) and maintain my composure. This is not too bad. With my diving experience, you would never break me this way.

Back to researching the advanced techniques:

The first of these is wet rag in mouth. I try it. Ok, I can handle this too. It makes it a little bit more difficult to maintain control. I didn't realize it, but the first time around I was selectively breathing through either mouth or nose, to help maintain control. The wet rag eliminates the mouth as an option. You have to really concentrate to maintain control, breathing very shallowly on the inhale and not allowing yourself to exhale until you have a good lungful with which to expel the water in your nose, throat and sinuses. Then, you have to inhale slowly but fast enough to pull in a lungful of air before your nose, throat and sinuses fill up. Difficult, but doable with some self-control. I can see where this would get very unpleasant if you lost control, but still, not terrible, not torture per se in my book.

Once your lungs are empty and collapsed and they start to draw fluid, it is simply all over. You *know* you are dead and it's too late.

Next up is saran wrap. The idea is that you wrap saran wrap around the mouth in several layers, and poke a hole in the mouth area, and then waterboard away. I didn't really see how this was an improvement on the rag technique, and so far I would categorize waterboarding as simply unpleasant rather than torture, but I've come this far so I might as well go on.

It took me ten minutes to recover my senses once I tried this. I was shuddering in a corner, convinced I narrowly escaped killing myself.

Here's what happened:

The water fills the hole in the saran wrap so that there is either water or vacuum in your mouth. The water pours into your sinuses and throat. You struggle to expel water periodically by building enough pressure in your lungs. But with the saran wrap, each time I expelled water, I was able to draw in less air. Finally, the lungs can no longer expel water, and you begin to draw it up into your respiratory tract.

It seems that there is a point that is hardwired in us. When we draw water into our respiratory tract to this point, we are no longer in control. All hell breaks loose. Instinct tells us we are dying.

I have never been more panicked in my whole life. Once your lungs are empty and collapsed and they start to draw fluid, it is simply all over. You *know* you are dead and it's too late. Total panic.

There is absolutely nothing you can do about it. It would be like telling you not to blink while I stuck a hot needle in your eye.

At the time my lungs emptied and I began to draw water, I would have sold my children to escape. There was no choice, or chance, and willpower was not involved.

I never felt anything like it, and this was self-inflicted with a watering can, where I was in total control and never in any danger.

And I understood.

Waterboarding gets you to the point where you draw water up your respiratory tract, triggering the drowning reflex. Once that happens, it's all over. No question.

Some may go easy without a rag, some may need a rag, some may need saran wrap.

I didn't allow anybody else to try it on me. Inconceivable. I know I only got the barest taste of what it's about since I was in control, and not restrained and controlling the flow of water.

So, is it torture?

I'll put it this way. If I had the choice of being waterboarded by a third party or having my fingers smashed one at a time by a sledgehammer, I'd take the fingers, no question.

It's horrible, terrible, inhuman torture. I can hardly imagine worse. I'd prefer permanent damage and disability to experiencing it again. I'd give up anything, say anything, do anything.

The Spanish Inquisition knew this. It was one of their favorite methods.

It's torture. No question. Terrible, terrible torture. To experience it and understand it and then do it to another human being is to leave the realm of sanity and humanity forever. **CP**

This account was posted by "Scylla" on "The Straight Dope" website on December 21, 2007.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. CLAIR CONT. FROM PAGE 1

farmers and farms. The number of hog farms has dropped from 64,500 in 1980 to 10,500 in 2000, though the number of hogs has increased by about 5 million.

Hog production is a factory operation these days, largely controlled by two major conglomerations: Tyson Foods and Smithfield Farms. Hogs are raised in stifling feedlots of concrete, corrugated iron and wire, housing 15,000 to 20,000 animals in a single building. Hog factories are the concentration camps of American agriculture, the filthy abattoirs of our hidden system of meat production.

Pig factories are the foulest operations in American agriculture. A single hog excretes nearly 3 gallons of waste per day, or 2.5 times the average human's daily total. A 6,000-sow hog factory will generate approximately 50 tons of raw manure a day. An operation of the size of Premium Standard Farms in northern Missouri, with more than 2 million pigs and sows, will generate five times as much sewage as the entire city of Indianapolis. But hog farms aren't required to treat the waste. Generally, the stream of fecal waste is simply sluiced into giant holding lagoons, where it can spill into creeks or leach into ground water. Increasingly, hog operations are disposing of their manure by spraying it on fields as fertilizer, with vile consequences for the environment and the general ambience of the neighborhood.

Over the past quarter century, Indiana hog farms were responsible for 201 animal waste spills, wiping out more than 750,000 fish. These hog-growing factories contribute more excrement spills than any other industry.

It's not just creeks and rivers that are getting flooded with pig shit. A recent study by the EPA found that more than 13 per cent of the domestic drinking-water wells in the Midwest contain unsafe levels of nitrates, attributable to manure from hog feedlots. Another study found that groundwater beneath fields which have been sprayed with hog manure contained five times as much nitrates as is considered safe for humans. Such nitrate-leaden water has been linked to spontaneous abortions and "blue baby" syndrome.

A typical hog operation these days is Pohlmann Farms in Montgomery County, Indiana. This giant facility once confined 35,000 hogs. The owner, Klaus Pohlmann, is a German, whose father, Anton, ran the biggest egg factory in Europe, until numerous convictions for animal cruelty and environmental violations led to him being banned from ever again operating an animal enterprise in Germany.

Like father, like son. Pohlmann, the pig factory owner, has racked up an impressive rap sheet in Indiana. In 2002, Pohlmann was cited for dumping 50,000 gallons of hog excrement into the creek, killing more than 3,000 fish. He was fined $230,000 for the fish kill. But that was far from the first incident. From 1979 to 2003, Pohlmann has been cited nine times for hog manure spills into Little Sugar Creek. The state Department of Natural Resources estimates that his operation alone has killed more than 70,000 fish.

An operation of the size of Premium Standard Farms in northern Missouri, with more than 2 million pigs and sows in 1995, will generate five times as much sewage as the entire city of Indianapolis.

Pohlmann was arrested for drunk driving a couple of years ago, while he was careening his way to meet with state officials who were investigating yet another spill. It was his sixth arrest for drunk driving. Faced with mounting fines and possible jail time, Pohlmann offered his farm for sale. It was bought by National Pork Producers, Inc., an Iowa-based conglomerate, with its own history of environmental crimes. And the beat goes on.

My grandfather's farm is now a shopping mall. The black soil, milled to such fine fertility by the Wisconsin glaciation, now buried under a black sea of asphalt. The old Boatenwright pig farm is now a quick lube, servicing SUVs.

America is being ground apart from the inside, by heartless bankers, and insatiable conglomerates. We are a hollow nation, a poisonous shell of our former selves. **CP**

Born Under a Bad Sky, Jeffrey St Clair's collection of essays about the American environment, from which this piece is drawn, will be published by CounterPunch Books in the early spring.

"Free Trade" Rejected: Africa Says No – and Means It

By Ignacio Ramonet

The unimaginable has happened, to the displeasure of arrogant Europe. Africa, thought to be so poor that it would agree to anything, has said No in rebellious pride. No to the straitjacket of the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs), No to the complete liberalization of trade, No to the latest manifestations of the colonial pact.

It happened in December, at the second EU-Africa summit in Lisbon, where the main objective was to force the African countries to sign new trade agreements by December 31, 2007, in accordance with the Cotonou Convention of 2000, winding up the 1975 Lomé accords. Under these, goods from former colonies in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific are imported into the European Union more or less duty-free, except for products such as sugar, meat and bananas that are a problem for European pro-

Subscription Information

Subscription information can be found at www.counterpunch.org or call toll-free inside the U.S. 1-800-840-3683

Published twice monthly except July and August, 22 issues a year.

1- year hardcopy edition $45
2- year hardcopy edition $80
1- year email edition $35
2- year email edition $60
1- year email & hardcopy edition $50
1- year institutions/supporters $100
1- year student/low income, $35

Renew by telephone, mail or on our website. For mailed orders please include name, address and email address (if applicable) with payment. To renew by phone 1-800-840-3683 or 1-707-629 3683. Add $17.50 per year for subscriptions mailed outside the U.S.A.

Make checks or money orders payable to:
CounterPunch
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ducers. The World Trade Organization has insisted that these preferential arrangements be dismantled or replaced by trade agreements based on reciprocity, claiming that this is the only way African countries can continue to enjoy different treatment. The EU opted for completely free trade in the guise of EPAs. So, it was asking African, Caribbean and Pacific countries to allow EU goods and services to enter their markets duty-free. The Caribbean countries agreed to initial an EPA with the EU on December 16, 2007.

The president of Senegal, Abdoulaye Wade, denounced these strong-arm tactics, refused to sign and stormed out. South Africa's President Thabo Mbeki immediately supported his stand, and Namibia also decided not to sign (bravely, since an increase in EU customs duties would make it impossible for Namibia to export or continue to produce beef). Even French President Nicolas Sarkozy, who made unfortunate remarks at Dakar in July 2007 (in his speech at the University of Dakar on July 26, 2007, he said the tragedy of Africa was that Africans had not really entered history and were not eager to embrace the future), supported the countries that were most strongly opposed to these agreements, saying he was in favor of globalization but not the despoliation of countries that had nothing left.

The EPAs aroused wide public concern. Social movements and trade union organizations south of the Sahara mobilized against them. And the revolt against them bore fruit: the summit ended in failure. The president of the European Commission, José Manuel Barroso, was forced to back down and accept the African countries' call for further discussions. He has promised to resume negotiations in February.

The time when Europe could impose disastrous structural adjustment programs is long gone. Africa has had enough.

This crucial victory is another sign that things are improving for Africa. In the past few years, the bloodiest conflicts have been settled, with the exceptions of Darfur, Somalia and East Congo. Democratic progress has been consolidated, and local economies prosper under the guidance of a new generation of leaders, despite social inequalities.

Africa has another asset in the form of massive Chinese investments. China will overtake the EU as one of the continent's principal suppliers and could beat the United States to become its most important client by 2010. The time when Europe could impose disastrous structural adjustment programs is long gone. Africa has had enough. **CP**

Translated by Barbara Wilson.

Ignacio Ramonet is the outgoing editor-in-chief of *Le Monde Diplomatique* and co-author of *Fidel Castro: My Life: A Spoken Autobiography* by Ignacio Ramonet and Fidel Castro.

This article appears in the January edition of *Le Monde Diplomatique,* and here, by agreement.

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Renew subscriptions, order books and t-shirts and read new articles daily at www.counterpunch.org.

1st Class
Presort
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED